

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claim 1 has been canceled.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification, p. 6, ll. 20-23.

Claims 7-16 are pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

Objection to Claim 1

Claim 1 is objected to as being duplicative of claim 7 previously presented in the second preliminary amendment. Accordingly, Applicant has canceled claim 1 and respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,966,776 to Ona in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. The Examiner contends that Ona discloses all the elements of the claims but does not disclose a baffle means and that Ona can be combined with the baffle means as disclosed by the Applicant. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant has amended independent claims 7 and 12 to recite a "rib portion formed along an axial direction of said arresting body and rotating with one of the two members." Applicant submits that none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests Applicant's claimed element and that, therefore, the claims overcome the prior art. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant also submits that Ona teaches away from Applicant's claimed use of a case body. Ona does not teach or suggest the use of a case body, let alone a case body with baffle means. Ona teaches that the absence of a case body in the hinge device beneficially "eliminates a projection obstructive in design or in use on the first member and the second member, contributing greatly to

design flexibility, because the rotated member is held without any lock mechanism.” Ona, col. 3, ll. 42-44; col. 14, ll. 43-46. Ona further teaches a way of “making the construction [of the hinge device] simpler.” Ona, col. 2, l. 50. Construction of the hinge device would not be made simpler by the addition of a case body component. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art, upon reviewing Ona, is taught away from using a prior art case body.

Further, Applicant submits that the basic construction of Ona does not teach or suggest the construction claimed by the Applicant. Applicant claims “a case body with a baffle means mounted in one of the two members.” Applicant further claims “a fixed cam provided inside said case body” and “a cam slider disposed to face said fixed cam” that do not connect in any way with either of the two rotating members. By contrast, Ona teaches a hinge device “comprising: a first cam fixed to the first member; a second cam fixed to the second member; a shaft means coaxially supporting the first cam and the second cam so that they can relatively rotate.” Ona, col. 3, ll. 24-28. Accordingly, the cams in Ona provide connection contacts to each of the rotating members, whereas the cams in Applicant’s invention do not.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ona in view of Applicant’s admitted prior art, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,187 to Mischenko. The Examiner asserts that the slider washer not taught by Ona is taught by Mischenko. The Examiner contends that the use of slider washers is well known in the arts and that it would have been an obvious design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a washer. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that the presently claimed invention is patentable over Ona in combination with Mischenko for at least those reasons stated above in relation to Ona. Further, Mischenko also teaches away from Applicants’ claimed use of a “case body.” Indeed, Mischenko explicitly teaches that the “invention eliminates a separate housing for holding the hinge components in assemblage, thereby decreasing cost and complexity of the hinge.” Mischenko, col. 2, ll. 23-25. Thus, neither reference teaches or suggests Applicant’s claimed use of a case body.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By


Louis J. DeJuidice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant